

Ranking Pool: WRE IA FY22 Riverine

Program: ACEP-WRE Pool Status: Active States: IA (Admin)

Template: FY 2021 ACEP-WRE General Template Status: Active

Last Modified By: Sindra Jensen

Last Modified: 10-14-2021

#### **Land Uses**

Land Use	Modifier 1	Modifier 2	Modifier 3	Modifier 4	Modifier 5	Modifier 6
Crop						
Forest						
Range						
Pasture						
Water						
Other Rural Land						
Associated Ag Land						

#### **Resource Concern Categories**

Categories				
Category	Min %	Default %	Max %	
Aquatic habitat	10	10	80	
Long term protection of land	10	80	80	
Terrestrial habitat	10	10	80	

Aquatic habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Aquatic habitat for fish and other organisms	50	100	100

Long term protection of land			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Loss of functions and values	85	100	100

Terrestrial habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %

10-28-2021 Page 1 of 6

Terrestrial habitat			
Resource Concern	Min %	Default %	Max %
Terrestrial habitat for wildlife and invertebrates	100	100	100

### **Practices**

Practice	Practice Code	Practice Type
Brush Management	314	Conservation Practices
Herbaceous Weed Treatment	315	Conservation Practices
Conservation Cover	327	Conservation Practices
Prescribed Burning	338	Conservation Practices
Cover Crop	340	Conservation Practices
Critical Area Planting	342	Conservation Practices
Well Decommissioning	351	Conservation Practices
Dike	356	Conservation Practices
Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation	380	Conservation Practices
Fence	382	Conservation Practices
Firebreak	394	Conservation Practices
Grassed Waterway	412	Conservation Practices
Land Clearing	460	Conservation Practices
Access Control	472	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Site Preparation	490	Conservation Practices
Obstruction Removal	500	Conservation Practices
Stream Crossing	578	Conservation Practices
Streambank and Shoreline Protection	580	Conservation Practices
Structure for Water Control	587	Conservation Practices
Subsurface Drain	606	Conservation Practices
Tree/Shrub Establishment	612	Conservation Practices
Underground Outlet	620	Conservation Practices
Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities	643	Conservation Practices

10-28-2021

Ranking Pool Re		
Practice	Practice Code	Practice Type
Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management	644	Conservation Practices
Upland Wildlife Habitat Management	645	Conservation Practices
Shallow Water Development and Management	646	Conservation Practices
Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt	647	Conservation Practices
Wetland Restoration	657	Conservation Practices
Wetland Enhancement	659	Conservation Practices
Forest Stand Improvement	666	Conservation Practices
Acquisition Process - Appraisal	LTAPA	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Update	LTAPAU	Easements
Acquisition Process - Boundary Survey	LTAPBS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Closing Services	LTAPCS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Environmental Database Records Search	LTAPERS	Easements
Acquisition Process - Full Phase I	LTAPFP1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review First Review	LTAPTR1	Easements
Acquisition Process - Appraisal Technical Review Second Review	LTAPTR2	Easements
Acquisition Process - Title Search	LTAPTS	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Contract	LTP30YC	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - 30-Year Easement	LTP30YE	Easements
Long-Term Protection of Land - Permanent Easement	LTPPE	Easements

### **Ranking Weights**

Factors	Algorithm	Allowable Min	Default	Allowable Max
Vulnerabilities	Default	10	10	50
Planned Practice Effects	Default	5	5	20
Resource Priorities	Default	20	55	70
Program Priorities	Default	15	30	30
Efficiencies	Default	0	0	0

## **Display Group: WRE IA FY22 Riverine (Active)**

0

An asterisk will be displayed to show that it is a conditional section or conditional question.

### **Survey: Applicability Questions**

10-28-2021 Page 3 of 6

Section: Iowa FY22 Applicability Question			
Question	Answer Choices	Points	
The land and landowner owner(s) are eligible for ACEP-WRE enrollment in Iowa.	YES		
	NO		

# **Survey: Category Questions**

Section: IA FY22 ACEP-WRE Category Question			
Question	Answer Choices	Points	
What wetland type is contained/restorable within the ACEP-WRE application area boundary?	Depressional		
	Riverine		
	Missouri River		
	Fen/Remnant		

## **Survey: Program Questions**

Section: Iowa FY22 ACEP-WRE Riverine Program Questions			
Question	Answer Choices	Points	
	6	20	
From the choices below, select the score from Section IA., "Wildlife	4	12	
Benefits":	2	6	
	0	0	
	6	20	
	5	15	
	4		
From the choices below, select the score from Section IC., part 2, of the ranking form "Applications in CRP":	3		
**************************************	2		
	1		
	0		
	4	8	
	3	6	
From the choices below, select the score from Section IIA. of the ranking form, "Economic Benefit":	2	4	
3 · , · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	2	
	0	0	

10-28-2021 Page 4 of 6

Section: Iowa FY22 ACEP-WRE Riverine Program	Questions	
Question	Answer Choices	Points
From the choices below, select the score from Section IIB. of the ranking form, "Restoration Cost":	6	12
	5	10
	4	8
	3	6
	2	4
	1	2
	0	0
The landowner will accept a 5% reduction to the determined offer value:	YES	20
	NO	0
From the choices below, select the score from Section IIIG., "Percentage of Application Area Cropped":	5	20
	3	10
	1	5

# **Survey: Resource Questions**

Question	Answer Choices	Points
From the choices below, select the score from Section IB., "Landscape Significance":	20	75
	15	56.25
	10	37.5
	5	18.75
	3	11.25
	0	0
From the choices below, select the range containing the score from Section IC., "Proposed Hydrologic Restoration":	25-30	125
	20-24	100
	15-19	65
	10-14	40
	5-9	15
	0-4	0
	>4	20
From the choices below, select the score from Section IC., "Threatened and Endangered Species Considerations":	2-4	10
	<2	3.33
hid the application coors points in Costion IIIA of the restrict forms?	YES	20
Did the application score points in Section IIIA. of the ranking form?	NO	0
Did the application score points in Section IIIB. of the ranking form?	YES	20
on the application score points in Section IIID. Of the fanking form?	NO	0

10-28-2021

Section: Iowa FY22 ACEP-WRE Riverine Resource Questions				
Question	Answer Choices	Points		
Did the application score points in Section IIIi (3i) of the ranking form?	YES	20		
	NO	0		
From the choices below, select the score from Section IC., "Water Quality Benefits of the Easement":	10	20		
	6	10		
	4	5		
	0	0		

10-28-2021 Page 6 of 6

FY22 Iowa Agricultural Conservation Easement Program Wetland Reserve Easement Ranking Evaluation							
Landowner/Project Name:	I Conservation Ea	County (Field Office):	wettand F	Prepared By:	asement Ka	Date:	
TOWNSHIP RANGE	SECTION	APPLICATION	ACRES			10/28/2021	
SECTION I. Environments	l Considerations	\$					
A. WILDLIFE BENEFITS (sel	ect one)						
6 4 2	□ 0				Score	0	
		•					
B. LANDSCAPE SIGNIFICAN	,	<u> </u>					
R	<u>PROPOSED</u> iverine	RESTORATION ACC	COMPLISHM	ENTS AND	WETLAND C	LASS	
EPISATURATED (FLOOD HYDROLOGY MAJORITY OF HYDRIC ACRES OCCUR	- ENDOSATURAT	TED (RIVER LEVEL RITY OF HYDRIC ACRES	Non-	Hydric:Hydr	ic Ratio	1	
WHICH FLOOD ZONE?	HAVE A <u>HIGH</u>	WATER TABLE OF:	<0.7:1	0.7:1-0.85:1	>0.85:1		
2 YR. ZONE 5 YR. ZONE		0 0.5 ft. 5 to 1 ft.	☐ 20 ☐ 15	☐ 15 ☐ 10	☐ 10 ☐ 5		
10 YR. ZONE		o 1.5 ft.	10	☐ 5			
>25 YR. ZONE	2	1.5 ft.	0	0	0		
NOTES:							
					Score	(Maximum 20)	
C. HYDROLOGY, WILDLIFE		_	BENEFITS	5			
	HYDROLOGIC REST  Conly One Box for Each				WATER (	QUALITY BENEFITS OF	
Stream Order 1st - 3rd Channel Condition Non-Channelized	6 4th-6th 3	>6th  1				EASEMENT	
Tile Present None/Blocked	6 <1000' Needed 3						
Man-made Elements All able to be removed	Some elements can be removed, few remain	Elements remain that significantly limit rest_atjor	1				
Includes both banks o	Boundary goes to	Boundary set back from	Total Score				
Eeasment Boundary Location  Tiver and is not a functional part of a	centerline of river and is not a functional part of a	riverbank or application area is a functional part of a	for Riverine Restoration		□ 6	Restoration of the application area will include provisions for	
drainage district	6 drainage district	drainage district	Section	ı		closure of an ag drainage well or similar abandoned private well.	
			0				
A	PLICATIONS IN CRE	•		ı			
		t in Contract				The application area is located	
CRP Practice	0-5	>5				within an Iowa Water  Quality/Nutrient Reduction	
	0-3	-3			□ 4	Strategy Initiative HUC8	
CP-9, CP-23, CP-23A, CP-27, CI 28, CP-37, CP-38B	- □ 3	□ 2				Watershed or a subwatershed incorporated under a Watershed	
26, C1-37, C1-36B			Total Score			Management Authority (WMA).	
CP-22, CP-25, CP-30, CP-31, CI	-		for CRP Section			G	
38E, CP-39, CP-41, CP-42	2	<u> </u>	(Maximum 6 points)		0	Score	
			o points)				
CP-2, CP-3, CP-4B, CP-4D, CP-5 CP-15A, CP-16A, CP-17A, CP-2	1	□ 0	0				
THREATENED & ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSIDERATIONS  # of Federal wetland dependent T&E species that restoration and management of							
	I result in protection or recover n Massasauga, Piping Plover,	ry of (5 pts. each). Eligible Topeka Shiner, Pallid Sturgeon	0				
# of State wetland dependent T&F energies that restoration and management of		0					
	and dependent species of conce plication area will result in pro		0				
List T&E Species Benefitted as Determined by IDNR Biologist:  SECTION I TOTAL:							
List T&E Species Benefitted as Determ	nined by IDNR Biologis	st: Score	0			SECTION	0 0

SECTION II. Cost Considerations						
A. ECONOMIC BENEFIT	A. ECONOMIC BENEFIT					
Dollars F	er Environmental Consideration Po	int <sup>1</sup>		ı		
< \$100 □ 4 \$101 - \$125 □ 3	\$126 - \$175 🔲 2	\$176 - \$225 <b>1</b>	> \$226 🔲 0			
<sup>1</sup> 2017 ISU Iowa Land Values divided by total points from Section 1				ı		
County						
Average per Acre cost based upon 2017 ISU Values #N/A	Dollars Per Environmental Consideration Point #N/A	Score	(Maximum 4)			
B. RESTORATION COST (only one check per shaded region)		•				
ESTIMATED PER ACRE COST FOR RES	TORING/ ESTABLISHING VEGE	TATION	1			
< \$500 □ 3	\$1001 - \$1500 <b>1</b>	> \$1500  0				
ESTIMATED PER ACRE CONSTRUCTION	COST FOR RESTORING WETLA	ND AREAS				
< \$350 □ 3 \$350 - \$700 □ 2	\$701 - \$1050	> \$1050				
		Score	0			
			(Maximum 6)			
SECTION III. Additional Considerations (ch	eck all applicable areas)			•		
A. Restoration and management of the application area would be		•	<b>2</b>			
documented <b>non-wetland dependent</b> INAI Threatened or Endang <b>B.</b> Application area is >35 acres and enrollment will result in a <b>co</b>						
added to adjacent and similarly protected easements and/or public		an 500 deres in size when	□ 4			
C. The application area includes a Fen or Hydric Prairie Remnant	with an FQI <u>&gt; 20</u>		<b>4</b>			
D. The landowner will accept (in writing) a 5% reduction to the d	etermined offer value.		□ 2			
E. The application is for a 30 year easement.			□ -30			
F. The application area is ≤35 acres and is not contiguous with an	□ -30					
G. Percent of Application Area Cropped (NOT CRP)	>66%□ 5	>33-66%□ 3	0-33% 🔲 1			
H. Percent of Application Area with Existing Vegetation Requiring Conversion	≤20%□ 5	>20-30% 🗖 3	>30% 🗖 1			
I. This application is for a permanent easement and would allow for the restoration of one or more acres of neighboring, partially			□ 4			
restored wetland currently enrolled in an EWRP, WRP, ACEP/WRE easement.						
	0					
	APPLICATION					
TOTAL SCORE			0			